REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following amendments and remarks contained herein in response to the Office Action mailed March 28, 2007. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance.

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 – 40 are pending. In particular, Applicant amend claims 21, 23 – 25, 28, 30 – 32, 35, and 37 – 39. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action indicates that claims 21 – 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, indicating that these claims are allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reason that independent claims 21, 28, and 35 include an element such as "providing the combined score to a user." Applicant respectfully submits that these elements clearly illustrate producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21 – 40 are allowable in view of 35 U.S.C. §101.

II.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action indicates that claims 23 – 25, 30 – 32, and 37 – 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. More specifically, the Office Action rejects claims that recite an element such as "determine, from the combined score, a potential risk." Applicant amends claims 23 – 25, 30 – 32, and 37 – 39 by removing the disputed terms, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Additionally, enablement for these claims may be found, among other places, in FIGS. 6A, 6B, and 6C and page 13, paragraph [0051] – page 14, paragraph [0053]. As a

nonlimiting example, FIG. 6A illustrates search results for individual items. FIG. 6B illustrates results for combined items. FIG. 6C illustrates potential areas of vulnerability. For at least these reasons, Applicant traverses this rejection.

The Office Action additionally indicates that claims 23 – 25, 30 – 32, and 37 – 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant amends claims 23 – 25, 30 – 32, and 37 – 39, thereby rendering this issue moot. Additionally, Applicant submits that disclosure of the disputed subject matter may be found, among other places, .in FIGS. 6A, 6B, and 6C and page 13, paragraph [0051] – page 14, paragraph [0053]. As a nonlimiting example, page 14, paragraph [0053] states "three areas of vulnerability are shown: identity theft privacy, and spam."

III.   **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

A.   **Claim 21 is Allowable Over _Woods_**

The Office Action indicates that claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,101,491 ("*Woods*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that *Woods* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More specifically, claim 21 recites:

> A computer-readable medium comprising:
> computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to search for a first piece of sensitive information;
> computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to search for a second piece of sensitive information;
> computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to obtain a result of the search for the first piece of sensitive information;
> computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to obtain a result of the search for the second piece of sensitive information;
> computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to assign a first score to the obtained result of the search for the first piece of sensitive data, the first score assigned in accordance with a predefined criterion;

> computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to assign a second score to the obtained result of the search for the second piece of sensitive data, the second score assigned in accordance with the predefined criterion;
>
> computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to combine the first score and the second score;
>
> computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to provide the combined score to a user; and
>
> computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to **determine, from the combined score, a risk for at least one identity-related vulnerability**.

(emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "computer-readable medium comprising… computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to **determine, from the combined score, a risk for at least one identity-related vulnerability**" as recited in claim 21, as amended. More specifically, *Woods* discloses an "[i]ndex manager 240 [that] monitors content 250 for changes. Web page content changes as the proprietors of their web servers modify the existing pages, add new pages, or delete pages" (page 6, line 42). Applicant respectfully submits that this is different than "computer-readable medium comprising… computer-readable code adapted to instruct a programmable device to **determine, from the combined score, a risk for at least one identity-related vulnerability**" as recited in claim 21, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 21, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

B. Claim 28 is Allowable Over *Woods*

The Office Action indicates that claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,101,491 ("*Woods*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that *Woods* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More specifically, claim 28 recites:

> A method comprising:
> searching for a first piece of sensitive information;
> searching for a second piece of sensitive information;
> obtaining a result of the search for the first piece of sensitive

information;
        obtaining a result of the search for the second piece of sensitive information;
        assigning a first score to the obtained result of the search for the first piece of sensitive data, the first score being assigned in accordance with a predefined criterion;
        assigning a second score to the obtained result of the search for the second piece of sensitive data, the second score assigned in accordance with the predefined criterion;
        combining the first score and the second score;
        providing the combined score to a user; and
        determining, from the combined score, a risk for at least one identity-related vulnerability.

(emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method comprising... ***determining, from the combined score, a risk for at least one identity-related vulnerability***" as recited in claim 28, as amended. More specifically, *Woods* discloses an "[i]ndex manager 240 [that] monitors content 250 for changes. Web page content changes as the proprietors of their web servers modify the existing pages, add new pages, or delete pages" (page 6, line 42). Applicant respectfully submits that this is different than a "method comprising... ***determining, from the combined score, a risk for at least one identity-related vulnerability***" as recited in claim 28, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 28, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

C.   Claim 35 is Allowable Over *Woods*

The Office Action indicates that claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,101,491 ("*Woods*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that *Woods* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More specifically, claim 35 recites:

        A system comprising:
        a first searching component configured to search for a first piece of sensitive information;
        a second searching component configured to search for a second piece of sensitive information;
        a first obtaining component configured to obtain a result of the

search for the first piece of sensitive information;

a second obtaining component configured to obtain a result of the search for the second piece of sensitive information;

a first assigning component configured to assign a first score to the obtained result of the search for the first piece of sensitive data, the first score assigned in accordance with a predefined criterion;

a second assigning component configured to assign a second score to the obtained result of the search for the second piece of sensitive data, the second score assigned in accordance with the predefined criterion;

a combining component configured to combine the first score and the second score;

a providing component configured to provide the combined score to a user; and

a determining component configured to determine, from the combined score, a risk for at least one identity-related vulnerability.
(emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a

"system comprising *... a determining component configured to determine, from the*

combined score, a risk for at least one identity-related vulnerability" as recited in claim 35,

as amended. More specifically, *Woods* discloses an "[i]ndex manager 240 [that] monitors

content 250 for changes. Web page content changes as the proprietors of their web servers

modify the existing pages, add new pages, or delete pages" (page 6, line 42). Applicant

respectfully submits that this is different than a "system comprising *... a determining*

component configured to determine, from the combined score, a risk for at least one

identity-related vulnerability" as recited in claim 35, as amended. For at least this reason,

claim 35, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

D. **Claims 22 – 27, 29 – 34, and 36 – 40 are Allowable Over *Woods***

The Office Action indicates that claims 22 – 27, 29 – 34, and 36 – 40 stand rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Woods*. Applicant respectfully

traverses this rejection on the grounds that *Woods* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of

the claimed elements. More specifically, dependent claims 22 – 27 are believed to be allowable

for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 21. Further,

dependent claims 29 – 34 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 28. Dependent claims 36 – 40 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 35. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/afb/_____
Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
  HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500
Customer No.: **38823**